Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

971762 APR 27 1998

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1997

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS and JOHN R. STANLEY,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956) 723-6925

62 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. When the State of Texas, by its courts, openly establish segregation within the laws of Texas, so that a woman is denied protection from such Texas laws, as per Texas House Bill 717[1] that is for the protection of all the ranchers of Texas — protection against criminal trespassers — and yet, Texas District Courts, Texas Courts of Appeals, Texas Supreme Court, have declared by their actions, that the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez has no right to such protection law, thus, the courts of Texas move to protect every criminal trespasser that, by force and aggression, take over the ranch of Maria, and threaten Maria with bodily harm while inside her ranch. — And documented evidence remains as facts.

II. When the State of Texas moves to use its courts in organize crime by attorneys, judges, officials, criminals, who conspire to target the elderly, so as to rob the elderly of their property, using inhuman threats and terror procedures, with torture tactics that compete with the most savage nations.

III. When the judges of the courts of Texas conspire with attorneys and crooks to extort large amounts of money, by using blackmail and public threats upon the old Hispanic ranchwoman. — And documented evidence remains as proof.[2]

IV. When the judges of the courts of Texas totally deny Constitutional and Civil Rights to a woman approaching the courts as Pro se using the stigma of "mental illness"[3] to silence her voice for her rights — thus, the judges of Texas in confrontation to the United States Constitution and Civil Rights.

V. When the Texas judge ordering the old Hispanic ranchwoman to jail (a dungeon) for not having a lawyer, and other

---

1. *See* Appendix B, p. B-15.

2. *See* Appendix B, p. B-10.

3. *See* Appendix B, p. B-13.

judges denying the old woman a fair hearing for not approaching with a lawyer — thus, the judges in confrontation to the laws of the land that guarantee for everyone equally that, "In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel" — (USC 28-1654) —

VI. When the Texas judges were in full knowledge that the old Hispanic ranchwoman was terrorized for 24 hours, with promises of "bodily harm" (torture) by Sheriff's officers, until force to sign many documents, without Miranda Rights — thus, Texas judges and Texas officials defying the Rulings of the United States Supreme Court of Miranda Rights* for everyone equally — and establishing a terror and torture police-state government that intimidates and tortures the defenseless elderly.

VII. When the judges of Texas (and federal judges) have placed the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria as an example of what will happen to a woman in the USA nation who shall approach the courts as Pro se, to represent herself — where she will never see any kind of a fair hearing — thus, severe segregation of rights upon a woman within the courts of the United States of America.

VIII. When the powerful (as Respondent Stanley) can move to defraud the old Hispanic ranchwoman of her property, with Texas and federal judges as his accomplice, giving orders to the state and federal judges to dismiss and impose heavy sanctions (extortion) upon the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez — and the powerful, like Mafia bosses can control the courts of the United States of America.

---

* — Miranda Rights — U.S. Supreme Court Ruling — Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 346 (1966) — Warning: A person taken into custody has the right to remain silent, and the right to speak to an attorney — if such rights are denied, then evidence from an interrogation are voided before the court —

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, moving before the Court as Pro se, petitions the Court for Oral Argument before the Court.

It is that without oral argument before the Court, by Petitioner Maria, a fair hearing is denied, as the same procedures of denial of rights as those of the lower courts.

It is that Petitioner Maria is the first woman in the United States of America, that for nineteen years (19) has moved by all levels of state and federal courts seeking a fair hearing, and all courts denied a fair hearing.

It is that Petitioner Maria, moving in all levels of state and federal courts, can now expose, with documented evidence, (1) the severe abuse of rights upon the women of the USA nation, by the courts of the nation who silenced the voice of thousands of women who petitioned for basic rights, with the stigma of mental illness — (2) expose the inhuman injustices upon the elderly to rob them of their property by corrupt judges who use their courts in organize crime[4] with attorneys and criminals to rob the defenseless elderly — (3) expose how the courts of the nation are totally controlled by the organize law profession, and how every citizen approaching as Pro se before the courts will never have a fair hearing, will be intimidated, terrorized, blackmailed, and force to extend large amounts of extortion — (4) expose how the Judicial Branch in the United States of America has been the worse abusers of women's rights.

It is that Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez has been before the Supreme Court of the United States with seven petitions from 1980 to 1992, and all denied without a fair hearing.

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro se

---

4. *See* Appendix A, p. A-17.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BILL OF RIGHTS — 1868

Fourteenth Amendment Right: Section 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

— The State of Texas, in confrontation and defiance to the Constitution of the United States of America, Fourteenth Amendment Right, by its courts, has openly establish segregation that an old Hispanic ranchwoman of Petitioner Maria, has no rights to equal protection of the law to protect her property, to protect her life, to be secure in her rights, to be secured from intimidations, and terror procedures imposed upon the elderly —

— The State of Texas by all levels of its courts has denied every right to a fair hearing (due process) — The Texas courts, in conspiracy with criminals and attorneys target the elderly Hispanic ranchwoman to defraud her of her property within pre-judge court cases.

— The old Hispanic ranchwoman shall never see a fair hearing or equal protection of the law in any of the courts of Texas — she is a woman, she is Hispanic, she is old —

28 U.S.C. Section 1251(2) — All Controversies between the United States and a State —

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented	i
Oral Argument Before the Court	iii
Constitution of the United States of America Bill of Rights — 1868	iv
Table of Contents	v
Table of Citations	v
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	4
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	4
Statement of the Case	6
Reasons for Granting the Writ	8
Conclusion	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Cited:

First Case Of Its Kind
(women an the elderly without rights)

Contents

Page

Statutes Cited:

Texas House Bill 717 i

28 U.S.C. Section 1654 ii

28 U.S.C. Section 1251 6

28 U.S.C. Section 1251(2) ..... iv, 4

28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1) 3

United States Constitution Cited:

U.S. Const. amend II 4

U.S. Const. amend IV 5

U.S. Const. amend V 5

U.S. Const. amend VI 5

U.S. Const. amend XIV ..... iv, 4, 8

U.S. Const. Article VI(2) 6

Other:

U.S. Supreme Court — Mirand v. Arizona ..... ii, 5, 8

Contents

Page

APPENDIX

Appendix A (Federal Courts):

U.S. Court of Appeals — Dismissed A-1

Appellant Disputes Dismissal A-3

U.S. Dist. Court Final Judgment A-12

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Award A-15

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Final Order A-17

Appendix B (Texas Courts):

Texas Court of Appeals B-1

Texas Supreme Court Direct Appeal B-3

Texas Supreme Court Dismiss B-8

Blackmail-Extortion paid to judge-attorney B-10

Letter from doctor to court B-13

District Court extortion demand B-14

Texas House Bill 717 ..... B-15

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1997

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS and JOHN R. STANLEY,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Before the Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as Pro se, moves before the Court with a Writ of Certiorari, so as that the Court review the unjust and unfair judgment brought forth by the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit.[5]

5. *See* Appendix A, p. A-1.

It is that Petitioner Maria has moved in seven appeals before the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit — from April 12, 1988 to October 14, 1997 — and all the appeals dismissed by defrauding Petitioner Maria of a fair hearing by moving in a conspiracy of judges and attorneys to use the deceptive reasons of "Failure to State a Claim", and "frivolous" — thus a woman approaching such Court of Appeals will never see any kind of a fair hearing.

It is that Petitioner Maria has moved with complaints before the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas, as Pro se, with eighteen (18) complaints from January 24, 1984 to March 3, 1997, and every case has been dismissed without a fair hearing for Petitioner Maria, the courts using the deceptive stigmas of "failure to state a claim" and "frivolous".[6]

It is that the Texas Supreme Court, the Texas Court of Appeals[7] 4th District, Webb County (Texas) District Courts all have defrauded Maria Graciela Ramirez of a fair hearing because Maria approaches the courts as Pro se.

It is that Petitioner Maria has approached the Supreme Court of the United States seven times (7), from August 8, 1980 to June 12, 1992, and all petitions denied.

OPINIONS BELOW

It is that the Opinions Below consist of part of the most extensive documented evidence in the history of the United States of America that exposes the most severe abuse of rights upon a woman citizen and upon the elderly, by all levels of courts in the nation.

---

6. *See* Appendix A, p. A-2.

7. *See* Appendix B, p. B-1.

(1) United States Court of Appeal Fifth Circuit[8] — No. 97-20626 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant -v- The State of Texas and John R. Stanley, Appellees — Filed October 14, 1997 — Dismissed February 26, 1998 —Denied a fair hearing to Appellant Maria — Court cover-up Default of Appellees —

(2) United States District Court Southern District of Texas at Houston, Texas — No. G-97-0690 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff -v- The State of Texas and John R. Stanley, Defendants — This complaint was forced out from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas at Dallas, Texas, where Plaintiff Maria had filed the complaint — Defendant Stanley ordered the United States District judge at the Dallas Division to send it to the Southern District of Texas at Houston where Defendant Stanley gives the orders to the judges — Filed March 3, 1997 — Dismissed June 26, 1997 — Plaintiff Maria totally defrauded of her rights —[9]

(3) Texas Supreme Court — No. 97-0261 — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant in a Direct Appeal on Texas judges defrauding Appellant Maria of her constitutional and civil rights — Filed March 21,1997 -- Dismissed on orders of Texas Attorney General on April 10, 1997 — Denied totally a fair hearing — [10]

(4) Texas Court of Appeals, Fourth District — No. 04-97-00800-CV — Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant

---

8. *See* Appendix A, p. A-1.

9. *See* Appendix A, p. A-12.

10. *See* Appendix B, p. B-3.

-v- Genaro Deleza and Manuel Barrera — Filed November 13, 1997 — Attorney for Deleza (Atty. Teresa Hunter) defending criminal trespasser Deleza, moved to intercept and rammed the ongoing appeal of Appellant Maria, and ordered the court to bring in Appellee Deleza as a counter appellant — Attorney Hunter and the court judges totally rammed aside the Court Rules of Appellate Procedures, with Attorney Hunter giving orders to the judges, and whereby three justices of such court (Justices Green, Duncan, Angelini) with date of February 10, 1998 declared by document that, "It is THEREFORE ORDERED that Maria Ramirez's motion for a "fair hearing" is DENIED". — The three justices of such court of appeals publicly attacked the 14th Amendment Right of the United States Constitution destroying due process (fair hearing) and equal protection of the law, segregation of rights upon a woman citizen by the courts of the nation.[11]

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1251(2), and Section 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. Constitution — Amend. II —The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed — The Texas courts have severely punish the old ranchwoman of Maria for carrying her gun inside her ranch, for defending her ranch and her life from criminal trespassers who take over her ranch and move to kill her —

---

11. *See* Appendix B, p. B-1.

U.S. Constitution — Amend. IV — The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches s[illegible]l not be violated — Officers of the law (police, sheriff deputies, constable deputies have trespass into the home of the old woman of Maria with threats, intimidations, terror, two times with torture procedures, threats of bodily harm, break into her ranch with threats, held the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria and her ranch under siege for three hours — no, no warrants for seizure, no warrants for entering, no warrants for arrest — under the Texas courts, the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria has no rights of protection

U.S. Constitution — Amend. V — nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself (herself), nor be deprived of life liberty, or property without due process of law — the old Hispanic ranchwornan of Maria was declared a criminal for defending her life from a criminal trespasser inside her ranch, was forced to go before a sham prosecution conspired by judges, criminals, and officials, was forced to go before a jury totally selected by the prosecution as in a fascist nation, was declared a criminal, was denied a fair hearing, was extorted of large amounts of money, was defrauded of her rights to her ranch

U.S. Constitution — Amend. VI — In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury — be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him — the court cases dragged for two years the "public trial" was held by a jury totally selected by the prosecution — no impartial jury — the old ranchwoman of Maria was forced to sign documents without Miranda Rights, was force to sign documents under terror promises of "bodily harm" as cattle-prods to the head as previously imposed to the old woman the witnesses for the prosecution loaded the court with perjury and suborn perjury.

U.S. Constitution — Article VI(2) — This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States — shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby — Texas District judges, court of appeal justices, justices of the Texas Supreme Court, all have defrauded the old woman of Maria of a fair hearing, because Maria approaches the courts as Pro se — the laws of protection by the state of Texas — the federal laws (Laws of the Land), the U.S. Constitution guarantee rights have all been denied to the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez, by the courts of Texas, thus, firmly and defiantly the courts of Texas establishing segregation because of sex identity and old age — and the Judicial Branch of Texas in total confrontation to the U.S. Constitution, Article VI(2) — and thus, 28 U.S.C. Section 1251, The Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction of all controversies between the United States and a State.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The severe abuse of rights upon women by all levels of courts have existed since the birth of The United States of America, whereby the women of the number one Democratic nation of the world, remain in bondage, with only the right to vote.

The courts of the nation, along the years have silenced the voice of thousands of women who petition for their rights, with the stigma of mental illness, or the silencer-gag used by the courts as "failure to state a claim or frivolous."

It is that the Statement Of The Case contains the same argument as the Statement of the Case in the seven petitions before the Supreme Court of the United States, that expose, with documented evidence, the severe abuse of rights upon a woman and the elderly, in Texas — whereby the courts of the

nation are the main obstacle of women's rights, and that defraud the elderly of protection rights — thus, for the eighth petition before the Supreme Court of the United States, Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez petitions the Court (En banc) to refer to the seven previous petitions before such court.

I. 1980 — US Supreme Court -- No. 80-194 — Filed Aug. 8–80 — Denied Oct. 14–80 — Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- The United States of America —

II. 1981 — US Supreme Court — No. 80.1320 — Filed Feb. 5-81 — Denied March 9-81 -- Maria Graciela Ramirez Petition For Writ of Mandamus —-

III. 1988 — US Supreme Court — No. 88-584 — Filed Oct. 5-88 — Denied Nov. 9-88 Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- The United States of America —

IV. 1990 —US Supreme Court — No. 89-1341 — Filed Feb. 22-90 — Denied April 16-90 — Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp., and GHR Energy Corp., et al.

V. 1990 — US Supreme Court — No. 89-1592 — Filed April 12-90 — Denied May 14-90 Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- The United States of America —

VI. 1990 — US Supreme Court — No. 89-1825 — Filed May 22-90 — Denied June 28-90 — Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- Judge Richard Woods, et al —

VII. 1992 — US Supreme Court — No. 92-113 — Filed June 12-92 — Denied Oct. 5-92 — Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- The State of Texas —

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The reasons for granting the Writ are that "Under God with Liberties and Freedoms Equal For All" do not exist for women in the United States of America when the courts of the nation severely defraud a woman before the courts, of every protective and security liberty and freedom rights — defraud a woman of the very basics to a fair hearing, which is a grave violation of the 14th Amendment Rights to a fair hearing and to equal protection of the law — when the courts move in severe violations of civil and human rights upon a woman and the elderly — when the courts of Texas refuse to accept a woman before the courts as Pro se, and the woman is jailed for not having an attorney — when a woman in Texas is threaten, terrorize and tortured with promises of "bodily harm" until force to sign false confessions (like prisoners of war), is denied Miranda Rights, is forced, under blackmail to pay extortion to crook,[12] attorneys, judges, and criminals, is robbed of her property on judges orders — when perverts as Respondent John Stanley can conspire with state and federal judges to rob the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez of her mineral-gas property[13] — when the judges of Texas can establish segregation to deprive the Hispanic old woman of Maria of the protective laws of Texas that secure her rights to her ranch — when the judges of Texas bring in final judgments based on one-sided hearing without a fair hearing for the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria — when the courts of Texas deny over and over again the pleadings of ranchwoman Maria for a Change of Venue as the press publicly and falsely accuses and condems [sic] Maria — when criminals, attorneys, and judges use the courts in perjury and soborn [sic] perjury to rob the old Hispanic ranchwoman of her mineral-gas monies and her ranch.

---

12. *See* Appendix B, p. B-4 - B-6.

13. *See* Appendix A, p. A-5 - A-6.

Reasons For Granting The Writ — So that The Supreme Court of the United States, with the documented evidence of Maria, move to confront the State of Texas and every State whose judges segregate a woman and the elderly of the security (Constitution) and protective (laws of the land and Supreme Court Rulings) rights guaranteed to everyone equally — and that the Supreme Court of the United States move to depose the judges that use their courts in organize crime with attorneys and criminals that rob the elderly and defraud the women of their rights.

It is that the State of Texas, by its three Webb County (Texas) District Courts, in conspiracies of judges, attorneys, criminals, officials, move to target the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez, so as to rob her of her land, and of her mineral-gas monies, using the three Webb County (Texas) District Court judges as accomplice, in the most savage persecution upon an old woman that has survived the inhuman injustices perpetrated by the State of Texas, and covered-up by Texas Courts of Appeals and Texas Supreme Court.

Respondent, The State Of Texas — (1) How many hundreds of women along the years, have the judges of Texas moved to stigmatize as of "mental illness", so as to silence their voice for their rights and or to rob them of their property (2) How many elderly women have the Texas judges, officials, officers of the law moved to intimidate, threaten, terrorize, torture, blackmail, promises of "bodily harm", so as to silence their voice for their rights — and how many elderly have been intimidated into handing over extortion (3) How many Texas judges, hiding behind immunity, have used their courts in organize crime with perverted attorneys, criminals, and powerful crooks, to rob the women and the elderly.

(The most savage persecution in the nation, upon an old woman, with the Texas courts as accomplice)

1979 — 111th Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Antonio Zardenetta — Feb. 6-79 — Dec. 14-81— Good Hope Refineries & Ensearch Exploration -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez — (President of Good Hope Refineries is John Stanley) — Defendant Maria robbed of her mineral gas by Good Hope Refineries — Defendant Maria denied a fair hearing all the way, send to jail by Judge Zardenetta for not having a lawyer and force to pay sanctions — Court handing over the ranch of Maria to the crooks of Good Hope Refineries — Maria threaten by GHR with "bodily harm" — Good Hope paying their lawyers with Maria's money held in "suspence" by GHR —

1985— 49th Webb County District Court (Texas) — Judge Ruben Garcia — Master in Chancery, Tom Goodwin — No. 8548 — May 9-85–Sept 19-85 — The State of Texas -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez by Webb County Texas, United Independent School District, Laredo Independent School District, who by threats and intimidations force Maria to pay taxes on the royalties of mineral gas, that Maria has never received — Laredo Independent School District, by its attorney (Joe Rubio) and its Superintendent (Vidal Treviño) threaten Maria to pay taxes when such school district has no jurisdiction to ranch taxes — Maria's ranch was placed with a lien, and Maria force to pay from her savings — Such is blackmail and extortion —

1987— 341st Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Elma Salinas Ender — No. 38,011 — Feb. 6-87 — July 19-87 — Genaro Deleza -v- Maria

Graciela Ramirez — April 1987 Civil Action No. 38,011 transfered to 49th District Court —

1987— 341st Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Elma Salinas Ender — Criminal Action No. 20,730 — Feb. 27-87 — The State of Texas defending Genaro Deleza -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez (Note that the Civil Action of 38,011 was filed before the criminal Action of 20,730 — Criminal trespasser Deleza in conspiracy with judges, attorneys, sheriffs, officials, all moved to conspire to rob the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria of her ranch with perjury and suborn perjury testimonies — Judge Elma Salinas Ender was adviced by Maria that Maria had been terrorized and tortured with promises of bodily harm until force to sign false confessions, and no Miranda Rights — District Attorney for Webb County (Texas) Julio Garcia was also informed, but ignored the pleadings of Maria —

1987-88 — 49th Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Manuel Flores (Visiting Judges Truman Roberts and Richard Woods) Criminal Action No. 20,730 — Feb. 27-87 — Dec. 8-87 — The State of Texas (defending criminal Deleza) -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez — Defendant Maria pleaded verbally and in writing for a change of venue when the news media publicly condemned Maria — the change of venue denied over and over again — the jury totally chosen by the prosecution — visiting Judge Truman Roberts ordered the prosecution not to proceed — prosecution ignored the orders of Judge Roberts — Sitting Judge Manuel Flores told relative of Maria that if Maria

open her ranch to criminal trespasser Genaro Deleza, that Judge Flores would dismiss the criminal case — Maria refuse to be bribed by Judge Flores — Maria was forced to go before the one-sided selected jury where the prosecution presented perjury and suborn perjury, and the one-sided selected jury declared Maria a criminal for defending her ranch and her life from criminal trespasser Deleza who moved to kill Maria with his truck while Maria was inside her ranch — the State of Texas by its prosecution moved to severely punish Maria the victim, and protect Deleza the criminal — Maria sentenced to four years in prison (two years probation) — the State of Texas in confrontation and defiance to the US Constitution, the Laws of the Land, the Rulings of the US Supreme Court —

1987-88 — 49th Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Manuel Flores (visiting Judge Richard Woods) — Civil Action 38,011 — Feb. 6-87 — July 19-88 — Genaro Deleza -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez — Maria threaten all the way — Maria denied a change of venue over and over again — Maria forced to go before Visiting Judge Richard Woods — one-sided hearing with Plaintiff Deleza and his witnesses and his attorneys in perjury and suborn perjury and Maria denied equal protection of the law by denying Maria a change of venue — Visiting Judge Woods spend most of the time asleep, as the hearing brought upon Maria are all pre-judged — the criminal of Deleza and his attorneys (Hunter-Gutierrez-Garza Gongora) extorted nearly 90,000 whereby John Stanley[14] in

14. *See* Appendix B, p. B-6.

conspiracy with Deleza attorneys, handed over such extortion money from the "suspended mineral gas money" held by John Stanley robbed from the mineral gas royalty money of Maria —

1993— 61st Judicial District Court, Harris County, Texas — Houston, Texas — No. 92-49272 — Judge Shearn Smith — Filed Oct. 1993 — Dismissed Feb. 23-94 — TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp. (John Stanley) -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez — The civil action by TransAmerican was brought upon Maria so as to silence her voice for her rightful monies stolen by TransAmerican (John Stanley) — TransAmerican declared to the court that the Supreme Court of the United States had rendered in their favor in No. 89-1341 in the Supreme Court of the United States in Maria Graciela Ramirez -v- TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp. and GHR Energy Corp., et al — The Supreme Court of the United States denied such Writ of Certiorari to Maria with date of April 16-90, and thus, the High Court giving permission to John Stanley of TransAmerican Natural Gas to continue defrauding Maria Graciela Ramirez of her mineral gas and mineral royalties —

1996 — 341st Webb County (Texas) District court — Judge Elma Salinas Ender — Visiting Judge Henry Schuble and Judge James Barlow — No. 96-CVQ-1504-D3 — Genaro Deleza and Manuel Barrera Jr. -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez Filed Dec. 1996 — Dismissed September 11-97 — Another pre-judged case of the conspiracy of judges, attorneys, officials, crooks and criminals to rob the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria of her ranchland

and her mineral gas monies — The sitting judges give the orders to the visiting judges to rob Maria of her property so as to set Maria as an example of what happens to an old woman who refuses to give up her property and approaches the courts as Pro se — the two criminal trespassers of Deleza and Barrera were given permission to take over the ranch of the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria although the Deed of Title of the ranch of Maria is a clear title no taxes owned, no public roads inside of ranch, no permissions for trespassing of criminal trespassers — Maria pleading for the protection of Texas House Bill 717[15] that protects the ranchers of Texas, but the Texas judges, by their actions, declare that the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria has no rights to such protection laws, and thus, any criminal trespasser can take the ranch of Maria by force, aggression, attempts assassinations — Attorney Hunter for Deleza is moving to extort $50,000 from Maria —

1997 — 111th Webb County (Texas) District Court — Judge Antonio Zardenetta — No. 97-CVQ-00087 — Filed January 1997 — Sept 11-97 — Manuel Barrera Jr. -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez — Maria begged for a change of venue being that Judge Zardenetta had sent Maria to jail for not having a lawyer in a previous case, but Judge Zardenetta refused the pleadings of Maria for a change of venue — the hearing moved on one-side without the defense of Maria — final judgement one-sided hearing with the testimony of Plaintiff Barrera and

---

15. *See* Appendix B, p. B-7.

his attorney Fernando Sanchez with perjury and suborn perjury — Judge Zardenetta declaring a default upon Maria, when Maria had filed before the court that under the 14th Amendment right to equal protection of the law, Maria in fear of Judge Zardenetta, moved to document and file a change of venue — Judge Zardenetta signed his name ordering that the criminal trespasser break the locks of the ranch gate of Maria and take over Maria's ranch — Judge Zardenetta and Attorney Fernando Sanchez threaten Maria to pay the extortion money of more than $36,000[16] or rob Maria of her ranch, and thus Maria, in deep fear handed over the extortion money — Maria had been threatened and terrorized by sheriff and constable officers coming to Maria's house to inhumanly intimidate Maria —

Respondent, John R. Stanley — Respondent Stanley has been the chief officer of Good Hope Refineries Inc., TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp., TransTexas Natural Gas Corp. — Stanley moves in bankruptcy and changes name, and defrauds his victims as Maria Graciela Ramirez — Maria leased for gas minerals to Good Hope in 1976 — the first gaswell in Maria's lease the MGR #1 started with fraud, whereby, without Maria's knowledge, such gaswell was "pooled" one mile — that was August 1978 — Maria locked the ranch gate — John Stanley takes Maria to court, threatens Maria with "bodily harm" — presents the court with false testimonies — the court defrauds Maria of a fair hearing, orders the sheriff to cut the locks of Maria's ranch-gate — Stanley, with the help of the courts, defrauds Maria of her mineral royalties, Stanley pays his attorneys with

---

16. *See* Appendix B, p. B-4.

the mineral monies of Maria — gives every crook attorney and criminal large amounts of money from the so-called "suspense" monies from the mineral royalties of Maria — Stanley conspire with bankruptcy judges to defraud Maria of the twelve (12) million dollars[17] awarded to Maria by the re-organization committee in the bankruptcy federal court case of Stanley's Good Hope Refineries where Maria was a Claimant — Respondent Stanley, along the years, has easily controlled and given orders to state and federal judges — and traitor judges do not do favors for free —

Reasons for Granting The Writ — So that the Highest Court of the Land move en banc, with the documented evidence of Maria, to confront the State of Texas on establishing segregation and severe abuse upon women and the elderly by the courts of Texas and its officials —

CONCLUSION

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, Pleads to the High Court, to hear the documented evidence presented by Petitioner Maria, that exposes the severe abuse of rights upon a woman, by the courts, and to expose the inhuman violations upon the elderly by the State of Texas —

Petitioner Maria, moves with the most extensive documentation of its kind ever to surface on the severe abuse of rights upon a woman and upon the elderly by Texas courts, its officials and its officers of the law —

It is that the Supreme Court of the United States, and the lower courts, already remain in disgrace upon its rulings to defraud the American Indian of its lands — remain in disgrace

---

17. *See* Appendix A, p. A-4 - A-5.

to defraud the Negroid people to the basic rights of liberties and force to remain in slavery — and the women of the nation and the elderly are easily defrauded of their rights by corrupt freak judges who use their courts, in organize crime with attorneys and criminals to rob the women, the elderly of their property and of every civil and human right -—

It is that Petitioner Maria refuses to give up her rights to her ranchland and to her mineral gas on orders of Texas judges — and thus, Maria is force to move in deep fear while inside her ranch — fear of another attempt assassination

Petitioner Maria is one of the thousands of women and elderly in the nation that are target by attorneys, judges, criminals, so as to rob them of their property.

To the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, there is a symbol of equal justice at such High Court represented by a woman, the Blind Lady of Justice — let Petitioner Maria's voice be heard before such High Court —

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956) 723-6925

APPENDIX A

(Federal Courts)

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS — DISMISSED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-20626
Summary Calendar

Filed February 26, 1998

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF TEXAS; JOHN STANLEY,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Southern District of Texas
USDC No. H-97-CV-690

Before JOLLY, BENAVIDES, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Maria Graciela Ramirez appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Ramirez has filed a motion to supplement

---

*Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

the record on appeal. Because Ramirez does not state the relevance of the documents attached to her motion and because the documents would not affect the disposition of her appeal, Ramirez's motion to supplement the record is DENIED. Because Ramirez does not address the district court's reasons for dismissing her civil action, she has abandoned the only issue before this court. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Ramirez's appeal is without arguable merit and is thus frivolous. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

Ramirez was previously warned in *Ramirez v. Woods*, No. 89-2976 (5th Cir. March 5, 1990) that she would be sanctioned if she raised any more frivolous arguments before this court. Accordingly, we IMPOSE a sanction of $105. Ramirez shall pay $105 to the clerk of the district court before she may file any appeal or petition in this court, except a direct appeal of a criminal conviction or sentence. Until she pays the sanction in full, the clerk of this court shall return to Ramirez unfiled any appeal or petition, except a direct appeal of a criminal conviction or sentence.

APPEAL DISMISSED, SANCTIONS IMPOSED.

A-3

APPELLANT DISPUTES DISMISSAL

NO. 97-20626

IN THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FIFTH CIRCUIT

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

Plaintiff-Appellant

vs

THE STATE OF TEXAS; JOHN R. STANLEY

Defendant- Appellees

APPELLANT IN DISPUTE TO THE COURT'S

DISMISSAL OF FEBRUARY 26, 1998

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez
Appellant as Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH CIRCUIT
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

APPEAL NO. 97-20626

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

Plaintiff-Appellant

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS and
JOHN R. STANLEY

Defendant-Appellee

APPELLANT IN DISPUTE TO THE COURT'S
DISMISSAL OF FEBRUARY 26, 1998

BEFORE THE COURT:

Appellant, Maria Graciela Ramirez, under the 14th Amendment Right protection to Equal Protection of the Law, moves to dispute the dismissal, and the reasons for the dismissal given by the Court.

It is that such Court was adviced by Appellant Maria that Appellant Maria was in fear of such court that had previously threatened Appellant Maria of severe punishments if Appellant Maria should approach such court.

It is that Appellant Maria, in deep fear of the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, moved before the Supreme Court of the United States with permission to approach such Court in

a Direct Appeal, and explaining to such High Court that Appellant Maria was under intimidations by the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit — but the Supreme Court of the United Sates indicated that Appellant Maria had to move by way of the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, and thus, Appellant Maria, in fear, approached the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, and such court accepted the presentations of Appellant Maria, when such court of appeals should have immediately adviced Appellant Maria that if she approached before such court, that there would be severe punishments for Appellant Maria, and that such court does not accept an Hispanic woman as Pro se.

It is that in the Dismissal document of the Court, such indicates — "Ramirez was previously warned in Ramirez v. Woods No. 89-2976 (5th Cir. March 5, 1990) that she would be sanctioned if she raised any more frivolous arguments before this court" — thus, why did the Court accept Appellant Maria in Appeal No. 97-20626 to pre-judge the appeal, to protect the appellees, and to "sanction" (extortion) Appellant Maria in the most inhuman procedures by the courts of the United States of America that move to rob the women of their constitutional and civil rights.

A CHALLENGE TO THE COURT

Appellant Maria moves to challenge the Court to prove, with facts, the reasons given by the court for such a dismissal of Appeal No. 97-20626.

It is that the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit and the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas have time and time again, used false-deceptive reasons to defraud Maria Graciela Ramirez of her Constitutional and Civil Rights —and such deceptive reasons are —

I. Failure To State A Claim upon which relief may be granted.

II. Ramirez appeal is without arguable merit and is thus frivolous.

In Failure to State A Claim — the documents presented before the Court by Appellant Maria are backed-up by the Constitutional and Civil Rights, and such is documented, by indicating specific facts within the documents submitted to the court.

It is that Failure to State A Claim, in the Education field, means that person has not met the requirements — yet, Appellant Maria met the requirements to graduate from High School (1941) — met the requirements to graduate from college with a BS in Elementary Education — met the requirements to graduate from college with an MS is Library (1965) — met the requirements to graduate from college in Journalism in 1966 — yet, in the courts of the United States of America a woman approaching the courts as Pro se, is silenced of her rights with the segregationist declaration that, she has failed to state a claim.

In the stigma of *frivolous* presentation the courts stigmatize a woman as pro se before the courts as frivolous. Frivolous means to idle, to waste time, lack of seriousness.

How frivolous can Appellant Maria Graciela Ramirez be, when Appellant Maria received three (3) academic degrees within three (3) years three months — a BS in Elementary Ed. 1963 — an MLS in Library in 1965 — an MS in Journalism in 1966.

How frivolous can Appellant Maria be to have received two (2) masters degree within one (1) year — one masters with a research paper, the Journalism masters with an outstanding thesis.

It is that if Appellant Maria had "failed to state a claim" in her requirements in the education field, why was Maria Graciela Ramirez awarded three university degrees.

It is that if the universities had considered Maria Graciela Ramirez as "frivolous", then why did East Texas State University awarded Maria Graciela Ramirez with two (2) masters degrees within one year. — Why did the Dean of Graduate School at East Texas State University congratulate Maria Graciela Ramirez on the success of her journalism thesis, and the state and federal courts of the United States of America declare that the documents of Appellant Maria are "frivolous without arguable merit".

It is that with filed date of November 18, 1997, Appellant Maria filed before the court that Appellees were in Default — and yet the court moved to cover-up such Default action.

It is that the presentation of Appellee Stanley consisted of giving orders to the judges to dismiss and to force sanctions (extortion) upon Appellant Maria, and all the judges render to the orders of Appellee Stanley.

It is that the presentation of Appellee Texas consisted of hiding behind the 11th Amendment, showing extreme illiteracy in the constitution and laws of the land, and the court accepted such worthless presentation.

CONCLUSION

It is that after nineteen (19) years of Maria Graciela Ramirez moving in all levels of state and federal courts, defending her rights and defending her property — it is now that with documented evidence, Maria Graciela Ramirez can prove to the nation that the women of the nation remain without rights, remain in bondage without rights, and the Judicial Branch (the

courts) refuse to extend equal rights to a woman before the courts — just as the courts of the nation refused to extend rights to the Negroid people in the Dred Scott case.

Appellant Maria will move to the United States Supreme Court, without hope for any kind of a fair hearing, but to prove to the nation and to the world that "under God, with liberties and freedoms equal for all" is a total farce when the Judicial Branch (the courts) in the United States of America segregates women from liberty and freedom rights and moves in confrontation to the Democratic doctrines of the nation.

How many of the judges and justices who call Appellant Maria as "frivolous" have received two (2) masters degrees within one (1) year.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant as Pro se
1517 Garcia St., Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
EAST TEXAS STATION
COMMERCE, TEXAS 75428

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL

AREA CODE 214
468-2236 OR 468-2204

July 26, 1967

Miss Maria Grace Ramirez
1517 Garcia
Laredo, Texas

Dear Miss Ramirez:

We are happy to present you with this complimentary copy of *Abstracts From Graduate Study*, East Texas State University, 1966. You have reason to take pride in being one of the contributors to this publication which is being widely distributed among institutions of higher education both in the State of Texas and in other states.

Congratulations on your contribution to this publication. Our personal and institutional best wishes go with this letter.

Sincerely,

s/ J. Cullen Sowers
J. Cullen Sowers
Dean of Graduate School

ps
Enclosure

This letter was send to Maria Grace Ramirez on her thesis for her Masters in Journalism — The Changing Status of Women in Journalism — s/ Maria Grace Ramirez

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Appeal No. 97-20626

U.S. Court of Appeals
5th Circuit

Maria Graciela Ramirez

Plaintiff-Appellant

vs.

The State Of Texas and John R. Stanley

Defendant-Appellee

APPELLANT IN DISPUTE TO THE COURT'S
DISMISSAL OF FEBRUARY 26, 1998

I, Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant as Pro se, declare that a copy of the above matter has been mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested, to ——

Texas Attorney General
Dan Morales C/O Atty. Rodney P. Geer
Supreme Court Bldg.
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

John R. Stanley
C/O Atty. Clarence E. Reed
1300 East North Belt, Suite 310
Houston, Texas 77032-2949

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez
Appellant as Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

3-9-98
Date

US DISTRICT COURT FINAL JUDGMENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

[stamp]
United States District Court
Southern District of Texas
ENTERED
JUN 30 1997
Michael N. Milby, Clerk of Court

CIVIL ACTION NO. H-97-0690

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS and JOHN R. STANLEY,

Defendants.

FINAL JUDGMENT

Pending is Defendant State of Texas's Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 8) and John Stanley's Amended Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 35), which motions are opposed by Plaintiff Maria Graciela Ramirez ("Ramirez").[1] After due

1. This appears to be another in a series of complaints Plaintiff Ramirez has filed against the State, Mr. Stanley, and Transamerican Natural Gas Corporation, et al, in some way related to an oil and gas lease on a portion of her real property. Four previous such cases (Cont'd)

consideration, the Court finds that the pending motions should be GRANTED. Plaintiff's action against the State of Texas is barred by the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Pennhurst State School and Hosp. v. Halderman*, 104 S. Ct. 900, 908 (1984). Plaintiff has not demonstrated either a waiver of sovereign immunity by the State or legislative consent for Plaintiff Ramirez to file suit against the State.

Defendant Stanley appears to be a resident of the State of Texas, as does Plaintiff Ramirez. Defendant Stanley further appears to be a private party, not an employee or officer of the State of Texas or any other public authority, and not a person who is alleged to have acted under color of state law. No federal question jurisdiction appears to exist against Defendant Stanley. In any event, the Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against Defendant Stanley or against the State of Texas. Accordingly, Defendant State of Texas's Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 8) is GRANTED and Defendant Stanley's Amended Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 35) is GRANTED, and it is therefore

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Original Complaint is DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

THIS IS A FINAL JUDGMENT.

(Cont'd)
were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, and all were dismissed with prejudice. *Ramirez v. Transamerican Natural Gas corp., et al.*, No. H-88-2343 (S.D. Tex. April 3, 1989); *Ramirez v. Stanley, et al.*, No. H-90-1600 (S.D. Tex., August 15, 1990); *Ramirez v. States of Texas, et al.*, No. H-91-0141 (S.D. Tex., March 28, 1991); *Ramirez v. State of Texas, et al*, No. H-96-1733 (S.D. Tex., October 4, 1996). The instant case was filed in the Northern District of Texas, and transferred to this district.

The Clerk will enter this Final Judgment and send copies to all parties of record.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, this 26th day of June, 1997.

s/ Ewing Werlein, Jr.
EWING WERLEIN, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

US BANKRUPTCY COURT AWARD

PAYING AGENT:

MARY LEE STORRS
THE CONNECTICUT BANK
AND TRUST COMPANY
ONE CONSTITUTION PLAZA
HARTFORD, CT 06115
(203) 244-7363

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
1517 GARCIA ST.
LAREDO, TX 78040

[hand-written]
Received by Claimant
on July 15-89
Send by Connecticut
Bank and Trust Co.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP.
CALCULATION STATEMENT
10/19/87 THROUGH 10/24/88

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIRIEZ
1517 GARCIA ST.
LAREDO, TX 78040

OBLIGEE NO: TR1030
DIVISION: 57
MAINTENANCE: 630
CLASS: 6
UNSECURED CLAIMS

THE TRANSACTIONS BELOW REPRESENT ALL ACTIVITY FOR THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED CLAIM FROM OCTOBER 19, 1987 THROUGH OCTOBER 24, 1988, WHEN THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT, CONNECTICUT BANK AND TRUST, BECAME THE PAYING AGENT. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED UPON REQUEST FROM THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT.

DATE: 10/19/87
DESCRIPTION: INITIAL SETUP
UNLIQUIDATED PRINCIPAL: 12,000,000.00
BALANCE AT 10/24/88:
ALLOWED CLAIMS
PRINCIPAL: 0.00
INTEREST: 0.00
LIQUIDATED CLAIMS
PRINCIPAL 0.00
INTEREST 0.00
UNLIQUIDATED PRINCIPAL: 12,000,000.00
ESCROW
PRINCIPAL 0.00
INTEREST 0.00

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP.
CALCULATION STATEMENT
10/19/87 THROUGH 10/24/88

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
1517 GARCIA ST.
LAREDO, TX 78040

OBLIGEE NO: TR1630
DIVISION: 57
MAINTENANCE: 480
CLASS: 4
UNSECURED CLAIMS

THE TRANSACTIONS BELOW REPRESENT ALL ACTIVITY FOR THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED CLAIM FROM OCTOBER 19, 1987 THROUGH OCTOBER 24, 1988, WHEN THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT, CONNECTICUT BANK AND TRUST, BECAME THE PAYING AGENT. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED UPON REQUEST FROM THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT.

DATE	DESCRIPTION	ALLOWED CLAIMS PRINCIPAL	ALLOWED CLAIMS INTEREST	LIQUIDATED CLAIMS PRINCIPAL	LIQUIDATED CLAIMS INTEREST	UNLIQUIDATED PRINCIPAL	ESCROW PRINCIPAL	ESCROW INTEREST
10/19/87	INITIAL SETUP					12,000,000.00		
	BALANCE AT 10/24/88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,000,000.00	0.00	0.00

US BANKRUPTCY COURT — FINAL ORDER

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

IN PROCEEDING FOR REORGANIZATION UNDER
CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE

CASE NOS. 84-03474-H1-5
84-03475-H2-5
84-03476-H1-5
84-03477-H3-5
84-03478-H3-5
84-03479-H1-5
84-03480-H1-5
84-05539-H2-11

CONSOLIDATED IN CASE NO. 84-0374-H1-5

CLAIM NO. 630-57

In Re: TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR ENERGY and GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC., TRANSAMERICAN PIPELINE CORPORATION f/k/a/ GHR PIPELINE CORPORATION and SOUTHERN PIPE LINE CORPORATION, SOUTHERN STATES, INC., SOUTHERN STATES EXPLORATION, INC., LAREDO EXPLORATION, INC., SOUTHERN PETROLEUM TRADING COMPANY, LTD., TRANSAMERICAN GAS TRANSMISSION CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR TRANSMISSION, CORPORATION and SOUTHERN GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY, and JRS REALTY, INC.

Debtors

THE GHR COMPANIES, INC., f/k/a/ GOOD HOPE INDUSTRIES, INC.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Claimant

ORDER

On this day came on to be heard TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation's (Debtor herein) Objection to Claim No. 630-57. Debtor appeared by and through Counsel, Claimant herein, Maria Graciela Ramirez, although noticed and having filed a response to said notice, wholly failed to appear. The Court considered the Objection and it is therefore:

ORDERED that Claim No. 630-57 is allowed as follows:

1. $496,164.30 as royalties due Claimant for hydrocarbon production prior to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Pre-Petition).

2. $242,298.49 as royalties due claimant for hydrocarbon production subsequent to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Post Petition).

All other claims made in claim No. 630-57 not expressly allowed above are disallowed.

Signed this 5 day of November, 1988

s/ illegible
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

PPP#3/COURTORDER
11/23/88

[Hand-written margin notes]

This is a fraction of what is owed to Claimant Maria

All the other claims like the twelve (12) Million dolars [sic] *awarded by the Bankruptcy reorganisation* [sic] *Committee to Claimant Maria Graciela Ramirez, were embezzled in a Conspiracy of the Court and TransAmerican Natural Gas of John R. Stanley*

APPENDIX B

(Texas Courts)

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS

COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO

[SEAL: THE STATE OF TEXAS]

February 10, 1998

No. 04-97-00800-CV

Maria Graciela **RAMIREZ,**
Appellant

v.

Genaro **DeLEZA,** Sr. and Manuel Barerra, Jr.,
Appellees

and

Genaro DeLeza, Sr.,
Appellant

v.

Maria Graciela Ramirez and Manuel Barerra, Jr.

From the 341st Judicial District Court, Webb County, Texas
Trial Court No. C-96-CVQ-1504-D3
Honorable James E. Barlow, Judge Presiding

Sitting: Paul W. Green, Justice
Sarah B. Duncan, Justice
Karen Angelini, Justice

ORDER

The pro se appellant, Maria Graciela Ramirez, has filed a document styled "A Fair Hearing is Guaranteed by 14th Amendment Right." This document appears to be a second motion for reconsideration, complaining about our November 21, 1997 order granting Genaro DeLeza, Sr. an extension of time to file his notice of appeal. As we explained in our January 21, 1998 order, the rules of appellate procedure permit DeLeza to perfect his own appeal. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 25.1(c). It is THEREFORE ORDERED that Maria Ramirez's motion for a "fair hearing" is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED on February 10, 1998.

s/ Paul W. Green
Paul W. Green, Justice

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said Court on February 10, 1998.

s/ Herb Schaefer
Herb Schaefer, Clerk

B-3

TEXAS SUPREME COURT DIRECT APPEAL

[stamp]
FILED
IN SUPREME COURT
OF TEXAS

APR 07 1997

NO. 97-0261

DIRECT APPEAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

Appellant

JUDGE ANTONIO ZARDENETTA, et al,

Appellees

APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL AND APPELLEES OBJECTIONS TO APPELLANT'S DIRECT APPEAL

Maria Graciela Ramirez
Appellant Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(210/723-6925)

B-4

In The

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

DIRECT APPEAL

NO. 97-0261

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

Appellant

JUDGE ANTONIO ZARDENETTA, et al

Appellees

APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL AND APPELLEES OBJECTION TO APPELLANT'S DIRECT APPEAL

Before The Honorable Court:

Appellant, Maria Graciela Ramirez, moves before the Court as Pro se, with a Response to Texas Attorney General And Appellees Objection To Appellant's Direct Appeal.

It is that the true jurisdiction of the Texas Supreme Court, or any State Supreme Court — is to interpret and protect the State Constitution, and the State Laws, so that the Rights of the people to the Constitution, and the Laws be Equally Secured for all the people — thus, when segregation or apartheid procedures, because of race or sex identity, appear within the Courts of the State — such moves in severe violations to the Texan Constitution and its Laws — and *in direct confrontation* to the USA Constitution Article VI.

It is that as per Texas Rules of Courts, page 318, the Rules on Direct Appeal indicate —

Rule 140 (a) Direct Appeals — Confines the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to questions of law only —

I. Why has the Texas courts denied to Texas Hispanic ranchwomon Maria Graciela Ramirez the protection Texas Law, House Bill 717, whereby Maria has no protection from criminal trespassers, or the right to own or protect her ranch — and men ranchers and Anglo-Saxon Texas ranch women are protected by such Texas law.

II. When the Texas Constitution gives the right to everyone to own property — why do Texas judges, in conspiracy with criminals and attorneys, defraud the Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria of her ranch property

III. What power do the Texas Judges have to segregate the Texas Hispanic ranchwoman of her protective rights to Texan House Bill that protects ALL the Texas ranchers.

Rule 140 (c) Direct Appeal — A statement of facts shall not be brought up *except* to the extent it is to show that the appellant has an interest in the subject matter of the appeal —

I. A statement of facts has been presented by Appellant Maria, so as to justify the right to a Direct Appeal, for an investigation, upon

documentation of laws violated, and segregation of rights and protective laws because of race and sex identity.

II. It is that in a Direct Appeal there are no Appellees, nor Texas Attorney General, ordering the Texas Supreme Court to dismiss the Direct Appeal and cover-up the severe and inhuman violations of the laws and of the rights of the people, by judges of the lower courts.

III. In what part of the Texas Constitution does it declare that the Texas Attorney General and judges of the lower courts have the power to order the Texas Supreme Court to dismiss a Direct Appeal that deals with the Laws of Texas, and where such Texas laws have been voided for certain people because of their race and sex identity.

CONCLUSION

It is that when the Texas Attorney General, with his staff of attorneys, move with Appellees, to Order the Texas Supreme Court to dismiss the Direct Appeal of Appellant — then such becomes another cover-up of severe violations of civil and human rights existing within Texas, directly imposed by Texas judges and officials.

Appellant Maria pleads to the Court to proceed with the Direct Appeal and investigation, based on documented evidence, that exist. — It is that at the present time Appellant Maria remains without the protective law for ranchers and defrauded of her ranch by the Texas judges.

Respectfully submitted,
s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant Pro se
1517 Garcia St., Laredo, Texas 78040
(210/723-6925)

TEXAS SUPREME COURT DISMISS

[state seal of Texas] **THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS**
Post Office Box 12248
Austin, Texas 78711

(512) 463-1312

April 10, 1997

The Honorable Dan Morales
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Dan Morales, A.G.
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, TX 78711-2548

Mr. Blake O. Brodersen
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Dan Morales, A.G.
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, TX 78711-2548

RE: Case Number 97-0261

Style: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ v. HONORABLE MANUEL P. FLORES, HONORABLE ANTONIO A. ZARDENETTA, HONORABLE ELMA TERESA SALINAS ENDER
Original Direct Appeal Proceeding

Dear Counsel:

Today, the Supreme Court of Texas dismissed the above referenced direct appeal for want of jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

John T. Adams, Clerk
by s/ Courtland Crocker
Courtland Crocker
Deputy

cc: Ms. Maria Graciela Ramirez
The Hon. Elma T.S. Ender
Hon. Manuel R. Flores
The Hon. Henry G. Schuble
Hon. Antonio A. Zardenetta

B-10

BLACKMAIL-EXTORTION PAID TO JUDGE-ATTORNEY

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF WEBB
111th DISTRICT COURT
JUDGE ANTONIO ZARDENETTA

CAUSE NO. 97CVQ00087-D2

MANUEL J. BARRERA,

Plaintiff

vs.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant

AFFIDAVIT

I, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as Defendant in the above named Cause, moves to pay the Blackmail-Extortion monies demanded by Attorney Fernando Sanchez, and Judge Antonio Zardenetta of the 111th District Court for Webb County District Court.

It is that Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez has been continually threaten, and terrorize by Sheriff officers and Constable officers into paying the Blackmail-extortion, or else robbed of Defendant's property.

It is that Cause No. 97CVQ00087-D2 is still pending with Defendant's petition for a Change of Venue under the protection of 14th Amendment Right of the United States Constitution,

and no judge can deny such protective Constitutional Right to anyone.

Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez, at the present time is an Appellant before the United States Court of Appeal in Maria Graciela Ramirez, Appellant -v- The State of Texas and John Stanley in No. 97-20626, whereby Appellant Maria confronts the State of Texas with the severe abuse of rights by the three Webb County (Texas) District judges, including Judge Antonio Zardenetta in grave violations of civil and human rights upon Appellant Maria.

Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez, at the present time, is an Appellant in the Texas Court of Appeals 4th District, where Attorney Fernando Sanchez is included with his Blackmail and extortion threats upon Appellant Maria.

It is that Judge Antonio Zardenetta, in conspiracy with Attorney Fernando Sanchez, has now moved directly in the federal laws of blackmail, extortion and racketeering, and used the court for such criminal violations.

It is that Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez, in deep fear of being terrorized and threaten by the Sheriff deputies and Constable deputies — and in fear of having her ranch sold by the court — then Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez moves to extend the blackmail-extortion monies demanded by Judge Antonio Zardenetta and his accomplice Attorney Fernando Sanchez.

The amount of the extortion demand of $36,083.00 is enclosed with check No. 4055, and dated 12-12-97 signed by Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez.

In Affirmation,
s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez
Defendant as Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

Subscribed and affirmed before me
this 12th day of December 1997
s/ Marta Alicia Garcia
Marta Alicia Garcia
Notary Public, Webb County, Texas
Commission Expires 02-01-98

[Notary's Stamp]

[FACSIMILE OF CHECK NO. 4055 DATED DECEMBER 12, 1997 PAID TO THE ORDER OF WEBB COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK IN THE AMOUNT OF $36,083.00 (THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND EIGHTY THREE AND NO/100 DOLLARS), DRAWN ON NBC BANK LAREDO N.A. AND SIGNED BY MARIA GRACIELLA RAMIREZ]

Webb County District Court Judge Antonio Zardenetta and Attorney Fernando Sanchez (for Manuel Barrera Jr.) send sheriff and constable deputies to the home of Maria Graciela Ramirez to threaten and terrorize Maria into paying the extortion money so demanded by Judge Zardenetta and Atty. Sanchez, or else Maria's ranch would be sold at auction — so, in deep fear, Maria paid the blackmail and extortion money.

s/ Maria Graciella Ramirez

LETTER FROM DOCTOR TO COURT

F. M. CANSECO M.D. F.A.C.S.
1419 GUADALUPE ST.
LAREDO, TEXAS 78040
512-723-4306

Aug. 17, 1987

Mr. Manuel Flores,
District Judge, 49th. District Court,
Laredo, Texas, 78040

RE: Maria Graciela Ramirez
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas

Dear Sir:

I have treated Miss Maria Graciela Ramirez for many years for medical conditions.

In all these years she has at no time impressed me of being in need of psychiatric consultation.

Sincerely yours,
s/ F.M. Canseco M.D.
F.M. Canseco M.D.

[hand-written note]
Texas District Judge Manuel Flores of 49th District Court for Webb County Texas — and Federal District Judge James DeAnda of United States District Court for Southern District of Texas, conspired to publicly stigmatized Maria Graciela Ramirez as "Mentally Incompetent," and as "Emotionally Disturb," in Conspiracy with Trans American Natural Gas Corp., to embezzle the mineral royalty monies of Maria Graciela Ramirez. Dr. Canseco letter was destroyed by Judge Manuel Flores.

s/ Maria Graciella Ramirez

DISTRICT COURT EXTORTION DEMAND

[hand-written note] *The $89,391.18 was embezzled from the mineral trust of Maria Graciela Ramirez, by the Conspiracy of TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp., Texas Judge Manuel Flores, Webb County (Texas) Sherriff* [sic] *Santos, and others.*

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez

THE CONNECTICUT BANK AND
TRUST COMPANY, N.A.
CORPORATE TRUST DEPARTMENT
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
PAYING AGENCY

ROYALTY PAYMENT

W2395 Webb County Sheriff $89,391.18

THE CONNECTICUT BANK AND
TRUST COMPANY, N.A.
CORPORATE TRUST DEPARTMENT
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
PAYING AGENCY

001565

DATE PAY EXACTLY

10/26/88 **$89,391.18**

PAY
TO THE
ORDER Webb County Sheriff
OF

s/ illegible

THE CONNECTICUT BANK AND TRUST COMPANY,
N.A., HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06115

TEXAS HOUSE BILL 717

Texas House Bill 717 by the Texas 67th Legislature

To Protect all the ranchers of Texas from criminal trespassers—

Crossing any fence or other enclosure designed to keep livestock in or trespassers out, constitutes trespassing — also, "No Trespassing" signs are sufficient to keep out trespassers, in the absence of a fence. — Persons can be charged with trespassing on property even if the area is not posted with signs. Texas House Bill 717 indicates the fines and penalties for trespassing into ranch lands ranging from $1000 to $2000, and jail terms.

Why do the Texas courts deny this protection law to the Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria Graciela Ramirez ranching in Webb County, Texas — with the courts of Texas protecting the criminal trespassers, and severely persecuting the old Hispanic ranchwoman of Maria and giving the ranchlands of Maria to the criminal trespassers. — What rights do the State of Texas have to defraud the Hispanic ranchwoman of her legal property —